



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,324	05/24/2001	Mitsunori Maruyama		1377

30132 7590 03/25/2005

GEORGE A. LOUD
3137 MOUNT VERNON AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22305

EXAMINER

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/863,324

Applicant(s)

MARUYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Victor S Chang

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attached NOTE. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 8 and 9.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached NOTE.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: PTO-892.

Elizabeth M. De

72

NOTE

1. The After Final Amendment is not entered. It is noted that the proposed amendments to claim 1 recites "A protective film transfer sheet comprising a peelable support and a protective film formed on one surface of the support, wherein the protective film comprises a protective layer and an adhesive layer formed on the support in this order and wherein", and deletes "with the protective layer laminated to the support, wherein". Such amendments, while clarifies the order of the layers in the laminate, clearly narrows the scope of the invention and raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.
2. With respect to Applicants' argument "the polyurethane acrylate is described by Mori as a "prepolymer" ... as such, would not have a molecular weight as high as 50,000." (Remarks, page 11, last three lines), the Examiner notes that a prepolymer is "a partially polymerized substance, or one polymerized to a low degree of polymerization, for subsequent conversion to a high polymer (see attached definition of prepolymer from "Concise Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Engineering", page 902). In other words, it is simply a relative term between an intermediate material (prepolymer) and final product (polymer), there is no requirement for the molecular weight of a prepolymer to be less than 50,000. In particular, it should be noted that, in the absence of factual support, Applicants' argument cannot take place of evidence.
3. With respect to Applicants argument "the teachings of Mori et al are directed to a protective film providing good "wear resistance" and "hardness" ... it would have been

Art Unit: 1771

nonsensical for one skilled in the art to incorporate components of the Mori et al film which are intended to provide high “wear resistance” and “hardness” into the adhesive layer of Japanese ‘097 which is not designed to provide either “wear resistance” or “hardness”, properties totally irrelevant to the only purpose and function of the adhesive layer of Japanese ‘097.” (Remarks, pages 13-14), the Examiner repeats that Mori et al. is directed to a protective film for photo masks and lith films, which is in the same field of endeavor as JP ‘097 and the instant invention, while Mori teaches an embodiment having a different structure, Mori does teach that cured films have markedly superior adhesiveness to photo mask substrates and lith film substrates (column 3, lines 42-45). As such, clearly Mori’s curable layer is an adhesive layer, and it would have been obvious to combine Mori’s curable adhesive layer with JP ‘097, which teaches the same structural elements as the instant invention. Applicants argument are clearly directed to Mori individually, and fails to recognize that the rejection is based on the combined teachings of JP ‘097 and Mori.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-1474. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Terrel H Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VSC
Victor S Chang
Examiner
Art Unit 1771

3/15/2005

Elizabeth M. O'Leary